

HOME EXAM (HJEMMEKSAMEN) FOR LING2104 IN HØST 2018

Please answer **only one** of the two exam questions given below. You must answer all parts of the question that you choose. Please write 5-7 pages (not counting structure diagrams). Use appropriate style, language, and citations (just like we practiced in the *kvalifiseringsoppgave*).

Note that your submission must be anonymous, but please include your candidate number.

Question 1: Zeijlstra 2013

Note: In this task, you should focus on parts [c] and [d]. In parts [a] and [b], you introduce the topic; parts [a] and [b] should thus only amount to approx. ½ page each.

[a] In your own words, please explain the core claims put forward by Zeijlstra 2013. What is the core research question/puzzle that Zeijlstra addresses? Be explicit (throughout)!

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2013. Not in the first place. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31, 865-900.

[b] Please outline Zeijlstra's core argumentation in favor of his cross-linguistic claim(s). Please provide supporting data from Zeijlstra's writings to support your prose. (Feel free to optionally consult Zeijlstra 2016 for additional data and background information, but you are not required to do so.)

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2016. Negation and Negative Dependencies. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 2, 233-254.

[c] Please describe the core patterns and observations in the Swedish data in (1) (from Zeijlstra 2013:867-868, 897). Discuss how Zeijlstra's analysis explains the data, focusing on the contrast between (1b) and (1c) (see, in particular, Zeijlstra 2013:894-897). Please provide illustrations of the analysis (e.g., by sketching syntactic trees / diagrams), as applied to the difference between (1b) and (1c). Please include additional examples of your own if you feel that they make a better point than (1a-c), but bear in mind that you must also discuss (1a-c).

- (1) a. ^{OK} Inte Selma utan Sven var det. Swedish
 NEG Selma but Sven was it
 'It wasn't Selma but Sven.'
- b. * Inte var det Selma.
 NEG was it Selma
 'It wasn't Selma.'
- c. ^{OK} Inte kom SVEN, utan BERTIL till festen igår.
 NEG came Sven but Bertil to party-the yesterday
 'Not Sven, but Bertil came to the party yesterday.'

[d] Please evaluate Zeijlstra's proposal in light of the Norwegian data in (2) below (from the *Oslo Multilingual Corpus*¹), focusing on the bold-typed word in each example (and on the sentence that contains it). Please explore options of how Zeijlstra's proposal could explain (2a), (2b), (2c) and (2d), i.e., try to "make the data work" in his approach. Provide explicit illustrations (e.g., sketches of syntactic trees) of how Zeijlstra might deal with these data.

¹ <https://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/english/services/omc/>

Then discuss alternative ways of dealing with (2) (drawing on relevant linguistic knowledge that you have acquired so far in your studies); this part is open-ended – for instance, you may wish to discuss the very nature of *ikke* and whether it could be ambiguous. Finally, please weigh up the costs and benefits (= the *pros and cons*) of adopting Zeijlstra’s approach.

- (2) a. Vi har to armer og to bein. Det er iallfall hensiktsmessig når vi sitter rundt et bord og spiller bridge. **Ikke** er det så ueffent når et romskip skal føres til månen heller. Men er det tilfeldig?

English translation: We’ve got two arms and two legs. That’s reasonable enough when we’re sitting round a table playing bridge, and it’s not bad for piloting a spaceship to the moon. But is it accidental?

- b. – Du har forstått at jeg bare kan lange ut og skvise deg med hendene? Jeg syntes nesten jeg kunne høre ham le. Han sa: – Det tror jeg ikke at du tør. **Ikke** tror jeg at du klarer det heller. Satt du ikke nettopp her og roste meg for min reaksjonsevne? Nesten clairvoyant, sa du.

English transl.: “You realise I could just lash out and squash you with my bare hands?” I could almost hear him laughing. “I don’t think you dare. Or that you’d manage it. Only just now you were praising the speed of my reactions, weren’t you? Almost clairvoyant, you said.”

- c. De andre fikk aldri riktig vite hva som hadde hendt henne, for hun var stille og fåmælt og hang bestandig med hodet. **Ikke** kunne de skjønne hva hun hadde å sture for som hadde moren sin hos seg hele tiden. Men så forstod de. Jenta var syk.

English transl.: No one had ever heard her story, as she was very quiet and refused to talk. She walked with her head bowed constantly. No one could understand what she had to sulk about, because she at least had her own mother with her. But they soon knew. The girl was sick.

- d. De bygget en betongbunker med vinduer. Vinduene ble pælmet inn et par dager seinere. **Ikke** vet jeg om guttene gjorde det fordi den der betonggreia fikk dem til å bli aggressive. Eller om de bygget leikehuset vårt som bunker med en gang fordi alt ble ødelagt i Gropiusstadt likevel, hvis det ikke var av jern og betong.

English transl.: [They built a concrete bunker with windows.] After only a few days the windows had been smashed in. I don’t know whether the boys wrecked the windows because the concrete thing made them so aggressive. Or whether our playhouse was built as a bunker because in Gropiusstadt anything not made of iron or concrete was vandalised.

If you are skeptical about the acceptability of the corpus examples in (2), feel free to also consult the short (8-page) discussion in Garbacz & Østbø (2014). (This is optional; you are not required to do so.)

Garbacz, Piotr, and Christine B. Østbø. 2014. Additive negation. *Nordic Atlas of Language Structures (NALS) Journal* 1, 467-474.

Online at: <http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/nals/system/archives/133/original/NALS-Additive-negation.pdf>

Question 2: Marantz 1991 / Bobaljik 2008 and Legate 2008

[a] Marantz 1991 and Legate 2008 present two different perspectives on case/Case. Please refer to the Norwegian examples in (3a) and (3b), and use these examples to explain the core differences between Marantz 1991 and Legate 2008 in your own words. Be explicit (throughout)!

- (3) a. Kvinnen så jenta. b. Hun så henne.
 woman.the saw girl.the she saw her
 ‘The woman saw the girl.’ ‘She saw her.’

Bobaljik, Jonathan D. 2008. Where’s Phi Agreement as a Postsyntactic Operation’. In D. Harbour, D. Adger and S. Béjar (eds.): *Phi Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 295-328.

Marantz, Alec. 1991. Case and licensing. In G. F. Westphal, B. Ao and H.-R. Chae (eds.): *ESCOL 91: Proceedings of the Eighth Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*. 234-253.

Legate, Julie Anne. 2008. Morphological and Abstract Case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39, 55-101.

[b] For 1st and 2nd singular pronouns in Norwegian, English, German, and Spanish, we can assume the morphological case marking in (4). Your task is to analyze the sentences in (5a-d). [i.] Please start by giving a precise description of the differences between (5a), (5b), (5c), and (5d). Then sketch an analysis of the case patterns that these sentences illustrate, [ii.] first in Marantz’s 1991 approach, and [iii.] then in Legate’s 2008 approach.

When suggesting your analyses (for [ii.] and [iii.]), you should provide illustrations (e.g., sketch syntax trees). Feel free to include additional examples of your own if you think that they make a better point than (5a-d), but bear in mind that you must also discuss (5a-d).

Context: the examples in (5a-d) are not constructed, but taken from the actual texts in (6).

(4)

	Norwegian		English		German		Spanish	
	NOM	ACC	NOM	ACC	NOM	ACC	NOM	ACC
1.SG	<i>jeg</i>	<i>meg</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>me</i>	<i>ich</i>	<i>mich</i>	<i>yo</i>	<i>me</i>
2.SG	<i>du</i>	<i>deg</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>du</i>	<i>dich</i>	<i>tú</i>	<i>te</i>

- (5) a. *Norwegian:* Du er meg. Jeg er deg.
 b. *English:* You are me. I am you. (= *English translation of (5a)*)
 c. *German:* Du bist ich. Ich bin du. (= *German translation of (5a)*)
 d. *Spanish:* Tú eres yo. Yo soy tú. (= *Spanish translation of (5a)*)

(6) ***Norwegian original***

Sofie trykket pekefingeren mot nesen I speilet og sa: – Du er meg.
 Da hun ikke fikk noe svar, snudde hun setningen på hodet og sa: – Jeg er deg.

(Jostein Gaarder. 1991. *Sofies verden – Roman om filosofiens historie.*)

English translation

Sophie pressed her index finger to the nose in the mirror and said, “You are me.”
 As she got no answer to this, she turned the sentence around and said, “I am you.”

(Jostein Gaarder. 1995 [transl. by Paulette Møller]. *Sophie’s World.*)

German translation

Sofie drückte den Zeigefinger auf die Nase im Spiegel und sagte: „Du bist ich.“
 Als sie keine Antwort bekam, stellte sie den Satz auf den Kopf und sagte: „Ich bin du.“

(Jostein Gaarder. 1993 [transl. by Paulette Møller]. *Sofies Welt*.)

Spanish translation

Sofia apretó el dedo índice contra la nariz del espejo y dijo: – Tú eres yo.
 Al no recibir ninguna respuesta, dio la vuelta a la pregunta y dijo: – Yo soy tú.

(Jostein Gaarder. 2008 [transl. by Kirsti Baggethun & Asunción Lorenzo]. *El mundo de Sofia*.)

- [c] Compare (5) to (7); while the examples (5a-d) contain the copula verb ‘be’ (and its counterparts in other languages), the sentences in (7a-d) contain the transitive verb ‘know’. In your own words, restate the difference between English/Norwegian (5ab) vs. (7ab) and German/Spanish (5cd) vs. (7cd). Discuss the following question: is this difference (between En/No-type languages and Ger/Sp-type languages) more likely to be a purely morphological difference, or a syntactic difference? Does it depend on the framework that you are assuming (i.e., Marantz vs. Legate)? If so, how? This is an open-ended question where you can demonstrate your analytical skills.

Please note: When you discuss the difference between En/No-type languages and Ger/Sp-type languages, you should make clear which of your statements (if any) are derived from the assumptions of Marantz/Legate, and which of your statements (if any) are pure speculation.

- | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-----------------|---|
| (7) | a. <i>Norwegian:</i> | Du kjenner meg. | |
| | b. <i>English:</i> | You know me. | (= <i>English translation of (7a)</i>) |
| | c. <i>German:</i> | Du kennst mich. | (= <i>German translation of (7a)</i>) |
| | d. <i>Spanish:</i> | Tú me conoces. | (= <i>Spanish translation of (7a)</i>) |